

Remarks/Arguments

This paper is submitted responsive to the office action which was mailed on December 23, 2009. Reconsideration of the application in light of the accompanying remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

In the aforesaid action, the Examiner has made a final rejection based upon newly cited prior art to Fogarty et al., US Patent 6,228,104 in view of Pierce US Patent 5,893,878. This combination of art is used to reject independent claims 1, 19, 30, 32, 48 and 49.

In making this rejection, the Examiner has acknowledged that the cited Fogarty patent does not disclose hooked elements, and this teaching is said to come from Pierce.

First, it is submitted that the structures shown in Pierce at 24 and 80 in Figure 13 are not hooks as called for in the present application. Rather, 24 is a point of material which is raised up out of the base material, leaving the underlying depression 80 as shown. Neither of these structures is a hook as called for in the present claims.

Second, even if the structures 24, 80 of Pierce were considered to be hooks, the structures of the device taught by Pierce are sufficiently different from that of Fogarty that a person skilled in the art would not consider combining them. This is because Fogarty already discloses a textured surface, and there is no need to look for a hook structure such as what is said to be taught in Pierce for incorporation into Fogarty. Further, it is submitted that a cursory review of Fogarty and Pierce would show them to be sufficiently different devices that a person skilled in the art would not expect interchangeable

features between them. This is particularly true with respect to the surface points of the jaws in Pierce and the pads in Fogarty, which could not be treated in the same manner as the jaws in Pierce in order to define the points in question.

New dependent claims 52 and 53 have been added. These claims are drawn to subject matter set forth in the specification at paragraph [0041] and shown in the drawings in Figures 9A-9D. It is submitted that these claims, drawn as they are to first and second overmolds, are allowable over all art of record.

Independent claims 12 and 13 are included in a rejection based upon Fogarty, Pierce and Bramstedt US 2,706, 987. These two claims are considered patentable for the same reasons as the claims set forth above. Bramstedt is drawn to a different feature and does not impact the teachings with respect to the hooked members.

This paper is accompanied by authorization to charge a fee for extra claims to Deposit Account 02-0184. It is believed that no additional fee is due in connection with this paper. If any fee is due, please charge same to Deposit Account 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,
George D. Hermann et al.

By /george a. coury/
George A. Coury
BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C.
Reg. No. 34,309
Attorney for the Applicant(s)
Tel: (203) 777-6628 ext. 113
Fax: (203) 865-0297
Email: docket@bachlap.com

Date: March 23, 2010